

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed August 30, 2005, has been received and its contents carefully considered. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1, 11 and 12 were rejected as being anticipated Poland et al. The remaining claims were rejected as being unpatentable over Poland et al. taken in view of Taki (claims 2-4), Lock (claims 5-7, 10, 13, 17 and 20), or Poland et al. and Taki in further view of Lock (claims 8, 9, 18, 19, 21 and 22). Without conceding the propriety of these rejections, each of the independent claims has been amended, and these rejections are respectfully traversed.

Each of the independent claims 1, 12, and 20 of the present application have been amended to recite that the first information collection device is an open path emission sensor. Such emissions sensors detect one or more components of the vehicle's exhaust. As discussed at the top of page 7 of the present application, the information collection device may include an open path emission sensor that detects one or more components of the vehicle exhaust.

It is respectfully submitted that detection of exhaust emissions together with the recited video image collection is neither taught nor suggested by Poland et al., Taki, or Lock whether taken singly or in combination with each other. Poland et al. for example, is directed to a laser speed detector, and is not understood to relate to emissions detection. Taki and Lock are not believed to remedy this deficiency.

The dependent claims are believed allowable for the reasons given above but also for reciting patentable features in their own right. In this regard, it is respectfully submitted that for example dependent claim 7 is fully patentable over the references of record. Dependent claim 7

recites a second information collection device positioned to capture at least one of speed acceleration and emissions data corresponding to a second vehicle. The Office Action asserts that Lock suggests two digital cameras. However, the Office Action is not understood to explain where the second device for collecting related to speed, acceleration and/or emissions is taught or suggested by Lock or Poland et al. Accordingly, independent consideration of the dependent claims, including for example claim 7 as discussed above is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of this application is believed in order and such action is honestly solicited. If the examiner believes a teleconference would be beneficial in expediting the prosecution of application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at 202-861-1696.

In the event this paper is not time filed, Applicants petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fee deficiencies or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-2036 with reference to Attorney Docket No. 87354.2880.

Respectively submitted,

BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP



Leo J. Jennings
Registration No. 32,902

Date: 9.12.05
Baker & Hostetler LLP
Washington Square, Suite 1100
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036
Telephone: (202) 861-1500
Facsimile: 202-861-1783